



**Indiana Department of Education  
Office of Title I Academic Support**

**Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Submitted electronically to the U.S. Department of Education  
May 2, 2008**

## INDIANA’S DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROPOSAL

### Executive Summary

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is pleased to have the opportunity to submit a proposal to adopt and implement a Differentiated Accountability Model for Title I schools beginning with the 2008-09 school year. After six years of implementing the current accountability system under the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), several things are clear:

- Fully one-third of Indiana school districts and charter schools have only one building per grade span, making local options for Choice non-existent. Employing the Supplemental Services (SES) option in Year 1 will offer all Title I districts and charter schools the opportunity to immediately begin addressing student needs in schools identified for improvement.
- A “one-size fits all” system of corrective actions, particularly at the highest levels of improvement, is increasingly difficult to support when the reasons for identifying schools for improvement vary so considerably.
- Since the overwhelming majority of Title I schools are elementary schools, our system needs additional supports to ensure the use of research-based best practices for teaching Reading.
- It is time to refocus Title I school improvement funds to concentrate those monies on schools with the highest levels of academic need.
- Although rigorous research is limited regarding the specific interventions that are most effective and the conditions under which they are effective, studies from the Center on Education Policy (CEP) report that *multiple* reform efforts tailored to the needs of the school are more likely to result in schools making AYP and exiting restructuring. While Indiana’s proposed Differentiated Accountability Model continues to rely on several of the restructuring options currently available, our plan takes CEP findings to heart by significantly augmenting the current accountability expectations through required support of increasing and differing intensity across the proposed accountability system.

These issues, and more, compel Indiana to rethink and to redesign our framework for Title I schools’ accountability, our expectations and the supports that are provided in collaboration with expert partners across the Department.

Indiana’s proposed Differentiated Accountability Model begins with a transparent Index rating system to better identify highest need Title I schools and to prioritize deployment of resources for assistance. Within the Model, best practices identified from high-need, high-performing schools will support teachers and students in Indiana Title I schools identified as most in need (Comprehensive<sup>1</sup>).

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this document, the terms “focused” and “comprehensive” are used to denote different levels of need..

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

Beginning with the 2008-09 school year, all schools identified as Comprehensive – whether they are in Year 1 or Year 8 of improvement status – will be required to fully participate in the [IDOE's new reading and mathematics Diagnostic Assessments](#), using Wireless Generation's mCLASS tools in Kindergarten through Grade 2 and CTB/McGraw-Hill's Acuity tools in Grades 3-8 to inform instruction across the school year.

Every Comprehensive school will be required to have a full-time literacy or mathematics coach who also will participate in IDOE-sponsored coaches' training. Professional development will focus on research-based best practices and strategies that build school capacity to create sustainable change.

Indiana realizes that what occurs in its Title I schools must build on what occurs prior to and support what happens after students leave the K-12 system. Through its federal Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant, Indiana is developing a comprehensive P-20 data system that will:

- Link and integrate data at all levels, including pre-K, K-16, and potentially the workforce.
- Connect educator, financial, and building-level data to student-level achievement and course completion data.

The [SMARTdesktop](#) initiative will provide a teacher portal to the comprehensive data system.

There is an urgent need to more precisely focus technical assistance and interventions on schools with the greatest need. Our proposal promotes meaningful reform in schools, provides options for parents and students, and improves teacher effectiveness. We will not allow schools to lessen the focus on all students reaching grade-level proficiency in reading and mathematics or circumvent the requirements to fix struggling schools.

In support of this application, Indiana notes that it meets the United States Department of Education (USDE) eligibility criteria for the Differentiated Accountability Pilot:

- As evidenced by the [USDE Approval Letter](#), Indiana's standards and assessments system is fully approved. The assessments were fully administered in 2007-2008, and results were [publicly reported](#) and are available on a dedicated [ISTEP Results Website](#).
- Indiana [Monitoring Report](#) verifies that Indiana has no significant NCLB monitoring findings.
- Indiana has an approved [HQT Plan](#).
- Indiana has provided timely and transparent AYP information to parents and the public through a dedicated [AYP Website](#).

Indiana also meets USDE priority criteria for the Differentiated Accountability Pilot:

- Approximately 29% of Indiana's Title I schools are in school improvement. The Annual Measurable Objective will increase in 2008-2009, and Indiana expects that 211 more

## Differentiated Accountability Proposal

### Indiana Department of Education

schools will be identified. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) state operating budget was reduced significantly by a deficit management plan in 2002, and additional reductions have occurred since then. The Indiana General Assembly has not provided resources requested to support schools in need of assistance. Both factors have made it difficult to implement a comprehensive assistance program for all schools in the state.

- Indiana's proposal accelerates interventions for the lowest performing Title I schools and uses a multi-faceted approach that is data driven and initiates substantive interventions earlier in the federal improvement timeline. Indiana's new comprehensive assessment system includes K-2 classroom assessment tools (diagnostic, interim, predictive) and 3-8 diagnostic assessments (benchmark, predictive, and custom tests built from an extensive item bank) that will be part of the interventions for the schools most in need. Indiana also will apply successful Reading First strategies and require strict alignment of state-funded professional development with an improvement plan that is based on school achievement data.

In summary, Indiana meets the eligibility and priority criteria. It has the data system and assessment tools and has identified the appropriate reform strategies to support this proposal. The Title I Committee of Practitioners is enthusiastic about partnering with us in this effort. We fully embrace this opportunity and look forward to the peer review discussions.

## Section I. Accountability

### **Core Principle 1: AYP Determinations Consistent with State's Consolidated Accountability Workbook**

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations are made for all Indiana public schools, as required by NCLB and as described in the state's accountability plan. The state's accountability system continues to hold schools accountable and ensure that all students are proficient by 2013-14.

The proposed Differentiated Accountability Model does not deviate from those provisions of Indiana's accountability workbook that provide for annual AYP determinations for all schools and school districts based on Annual Measurable Objectives that hold schools and school districts accountable and ensure that all students are proficient by 2013-14. Annual AYP determinations are publicly available at [AYP](#).

### **Core Principle 2: Transparent Information About AYP Calculations**

Indiana provides the public with clear and understandable explanations of how AYP is calculated for its schools and districts and how it ensures that all students are included in its accountability system.

All schools are included in the accountability system. [Indiana Code 20-31](#), Indiana's school accountability law, defines public school as any school, including an alternative school, operated by a school corporation (Indiana's term for school district) and any charter school. Indiana Code

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

20-31-8-2 requires the IDOE to compare performance of each school and school corporation to its prior performance as a part of the accountability system.

A school that includes a grade or grades below those for which there is state test data is linked with the school that students attend after they leave the school for which there is no test. The AYP determination for the school for which there is data applies. The 95% participation requirement, for all students and subgroups, is included.

At the high school level, since high school by definition begins at Grade 9 regardless of the configuration of a school building, schools that serve grades that are not included in state testing are “paired” for accountability purposes with the school serving Grade 9 or 10.

The State Board of Education has adopted the ESEA Goals and Indicators, including the expectation that, by 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics. The State Board of Education’s [School Accountability Rule](#) incorporates AYP into the state accountability system.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Definition – AYP designations for Indiana school corporations and schools are determined by student achievement and participation rates on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) in English/language arts and mathematics; student attendance rates (for elementary and middle schools); and high school graduation rates (for high schools). There are two ways for **schools** to make AYP:

- Meet **all** performance, participation and attendance/graduation targets for the overall student population and individual student groups (often called “subgroups”) with 30 or more students; **OR**
- For every student group that does not meet performance targets, meet attendance/graduation rate and participation targets and reduce the number of students in the group not meeting performance targets by 10 percent (**Safe Harbor Provision**).

Full Academic Year Definition: Since the Improving America’s Schools Act, Indiana has used the traditional October 1 class enrollment and staffing reporting date to determine if a student has been enrolled for a full academic year. This is the second of two fall reporting dates. It corresponds to enrollment for 162 days. The state ensures consistent application by collecting days of enrollment for every student through the Student Test Number System.

Minimum “n” size: The following minimum numbers of students are established for subgroup reporting and accountability:

- 10 students for reporting; and
- 30 students, with a test of statistical significance, for student subgroup achievement.

Statistical adjustments: A test of statistical significance is applied to AYP decisions. A school is considered not making AYP only if there is 99% confidence (75% for Safe Harbor) that the school did not make AYP requirements.

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

Parent and Public Information – ISTEP+ tests are given during September<sup>2</sup>, with results returned prior to Thanksgiving. State law requires that schools meet with parents to discuss remediation plans for students who did not pass. Remediation begins the second semester of the school year. Remediation funds are provided by the State. Funds also are provided for students who are at-risk of failure.

The [State Report Card](#) is available through the [Accountability System for Academic Progress \(ASAP\)](#) website. The report includes all the required data elements. It is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year. The IDOE plans to make a Spanish language option available.

ASAP includes data not required for state or local report cards but of tremendous value for school improvement planning and public reporting.

The state maintains a dedicated webpage for reporting and accessing AYP information, and there is a direct AYP link from every school and school district “School Profile” page. AYP information for schools and districts begins with a simple “dashboard.” (See example in [AYP Fact Sheet](#).) Succeeding screens provide detailed tables.

The public announcement of school improvement is made in the spring after all appeal determinations have been finalized. March 25, 2008 was the press release announcement of school improvement for the 2008-2009 school year. The state Title I office requires all schools in improvement to have their parent letters reviewed and approved by the IDOE prior to parent mailings. All letters must be sent to the Title I office by May 16. This timeline allows schools enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, enough time for parents to make informed decisions, and enough time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES).

**Core Principle 3: Title I Schools Continue to be Identified for Improvement as Required by NCLB**

Indiana continues to identify for improvement Title I schools and school corporations (districts) as required by NCLB and as outlined in the state’s accountability plan.

The proposed Differentiated Accountability Model does not deviate from those provisions of Indiana’s accountability workbook that identify Title I schools and school corporations for improvement as required by NCLB. (See “[AYP Results: By the Numbers](#)” and spreadsheets available on the [AYP website](#), as well as school and school corporation improvement designations available on “[School Profile](#)” pages that are accessible by school name, county, or city.

**Attachment #1: [AYP Fact Sheet](#)**

---

<sup>2</sup> The fall 2008 ISTEP+ will be the last fall test. ISTEP+ will be administered in the spring beginning in 2009. This will be a split administration. Constructed response items will be given in late March/early April, and machine-graded items (multiple choice, gridded response) will be given in May. The results will be combined for a total score, with results returned before the end of the school year. The mixed format nature of the test will not change.

## Section II: Differentiation Model

### Core Principle 4: Method of Differentiation

The method of differentiation of identified schools is technically and educationally sound, based upon robust data analysis, and applied uniformly across the state. The differentiation of schools is based primarily on proficiency in English/language and mathematics.

Indiana has identified 229 schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2008-2009 school year. Of those 229, the IDOE has been notified of 9 schools that will close and not re-open in the fall. Additional schools may close or become ineligible for Title I services. Table 1 shows a breakdown of the number of Title I schools, by year of improvement status, under the current accountability model.

**Table 1: 2008-2009 Breakdown of School Improvement Status by Year of Improvement**

Year One	82
Year Two	69
Year Three	38
Year Four	17
Year Five	6
Year Six	3
Year Seven	2
Year Eight	3

Indiana's proposed Differentiated Accountability Model would differentiate these 220 schools into categories of improvement labeled **Focused** and **Comprehensive** (which includes a subset of schools identified as Comprehensive-Intensive). Extensive data analysis was conducted and an Index rating was created to identify the category placement of schools. This Index rating was calculated as follows:

- Identify the number of cells that failed to make AYP in each content area.
- Calculate the percentage of available cells not making AYP including English/language arts Overall and Mathematics Overall.
- Convert the percentage to a number.
- Calculate the Overall distance from AYP Targets. The target used was the fall 2008 targets for English and Mathematics. Targets were combined and divided by two to create one absolute value.
- Add the absolute value of the distance from target and the converted percentage of cells not making AYP.
- This sum is the Index.

The 50 schools identified as **Comprehensive** are schools with an Index ranging from 60.95 to 149.7. Schools with an Index below (better than) 60.95 are identified as **Focused** schools. To provide additional intensive support to a subset of **Comprehensive** schools, a smaller group was also identified as **Comprehensive/Intensive** based on Index score. For 2008-2009, 10 schools



Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

with the highest Index (20 percent of Comprehensive) would be labeled as Comprehensive/Intensive.

The phases/years of improvement will not change under the proposed differentiated model. Schools will be identified as follows:

Year 1 Focused	Year 1 Comprehensive
Year 2 Focused	Year 2 Comprehensive
Year 3 Focused	Year 3 Comprehensive
Year 4 Focused	Year 4 Comprehensive
Year 5 Focused	Year 5 Comprehensive

Please see **Attachment #2 - [Differentiated Accountability Chart](#)** for an explanatory breakdown of each phase and its required interventions as well as a comparison to the phases under current law. The phases of improvement are based on the data analyses resulting from student proficiency in both content areas. The differentiation method analyzes student achievement for all students. Students in subgroups are included in the calculation of percentage of cells missing targets, but the method of differentiation is not driven or limited by achievement of a particular student subgroup. Please see **Attachment #3 - [Index Rating](#)**. Because multiple factors are considered in the status identification, the proposed method of differentiation does not systematically allow for any one particular subgroup that repeatedly misses targets over time to be in the least rigorous category of differentiation.

As outlined in this proposal, an Index has been created to rank schools in improvement according to need and then categorize schools –based upon their Index rating -- as **Focused**, **Comprehensive**, or **Comprehensive/Intensive**. In order to move between categories, a school must meet the Index requirements of another category for two consecutive years. This is true both for moving to a *more intensive* category as well as from a *less intensive* category.

**Example:**

Washington Elementary School has not made AYP for two consecutive years and is in Year 1 Improvement. Their Index score for 2008-2009 is 55, placing the school in the Focused category. On the following two state assessments, the school does not make AYP and the data analyses from the two additional assessments provide the school with an Index of 70 and 85, respectively. This school would be identified as Year 3 Comprehensive. Their year of improvement status has progressed and a more robust set of interventions is needed to improve the instructional program.

**Note: There are no responses provided for Guidance Question 4.4. The state is not choosing an additional academic indicator to differentiate among schools.**

Indiana will include in its evaluation plan an analysis of the degree to which the proposed method of differentiation identified schools needing the greatest interventions. We will use research to determine if the computations correctly identify the schools that are known by other means to be the most seriously in distress and exclude schools that are recognized not to need the



most intense levels of services. We will also determine potential adjustments to the differentiated method that are found to produce greater accuracy.

### **Core Principle 5: Transition**

When transitioning to the differentiated accountability model, Indiana will consider the current status of schools, including interventions previously implemented in schools and services provided to students.

The proposed Differentiated Accountability Model does not allow schools identified for improvement to start over in the intervention timeline. Years of improvement (Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc.) will continue to be used as labels, but schools will be differentiated by an additional label as either **Focused** or **Comprehensive** (which includes a subset of schools labeled Comprehensive-Intensive). Table 2 identifies for the 2008-09 school year the numbers of Title I schools identified for improvement in each year and category of improvement.

**Table 2: Number of Schools Identified for Improvement in 2008-09 by Category and Year<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Year 1 Focused</b>	<b>Year 2 Focused</b>	<b>Year 3 Focused</b>	<b>Year 4 Focused</b>	<b>Year 5+ Focused</b>
68	62	24	13	3
<b>Year 1 Comprehensive</b>	<b>Year 2 Comprehensive</b>	<b>Year 3 Comprehensive</b>	<b>Year 4 Comprehensive</b>	<b>Year 5+ Comprehensive</b>
14	7	14	4	11

During the transition period of 2008-2009, all students previously eligible under the prior system will be allowed to exercise their rights to public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES). Districts with schools that wish to begin offering SES in Year 1 will be approved to participate in this reversal in 2008-2009 by IDOE. All other schools will transition during the 2009-2010 school year. IDOE will adhere to all guidelines outlined in the SES/Choice reversal pilot. With the opportunity to differentiate accountability, Indiana proposes to switch the timeline in which schools are required to implement public school choice and SES. Fully one-third of Indiana districts and charter schools have only one building per grade span, making local options for Choice non-existent. Employing the SES option in Year 1 offers all Title I districts and Title I charter schools the opportunity to begin addressing student needs in Year 1 of the proposed differentiated accountability system.

Under Indiana's proposal, schools identified in either Focused or Comprehensive Year 1 will be required to offer Supplemental Educational Services for all non-proficient students in poverty<sup>4</sup>. Schools identified in either category Year 2 and beyond will be required to offer SES for all non-proficient students in poverty and at that point will also have to implement public school choice for non-proficient students.

<sup>3</sup> 10 Comprehensive schools with the highest Index Ratings have been further identified as Comprehensive-Intensive and will receive additional intensive interventions.

<sup>4</sup> Non-proficient students in poverty are defined as students receiving free or reduced-price lunches and students in grades 3-10 who fail to pass state assessments and students in non-tested grade levels identified as non-proficient through locally-determined assessments.

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

Indiana has participated in the Secretary's SES pilot for two years and has found that barriers to SES still exist. In order to combat those barriers and increase the number of students receiving supplemental services, schools in Year 4 Focused and higher will be required to maintain open/rolling enrollment for SES and allow providers to offer instruction on the school building premises after school. All Comprehensive schools must maintain open/rolling enrollment for SES, allow providers to instruct in the school building upon request for after school instruction; **and offer student transportation for SES tutoring.**

Districts with schools identified as Year 4 in 2007-2008 were required to plan for restructuring and districts with schools in Year 5 and beyond must continue to implement and refine their restructuring plans. Plans are due to IDOE by June 2008 using the template approved October 2007 by the Title I Committee of Practitioners. Due to the timing of this proposal, as well as deadlines for local contractual obligations, Indiana will honor these plans for the 2008-2009 school year and review them under the current accountability regulations. The new Restructuring requirements, including the elimination of the "other alternative governance" option will be implemented effective with the school category designation from fall 2008 state testing results. Superintendents in districts with schools in Year 8 will be required to meet with an IDOE panel early in the 2008-2009 school year to publicly submit and defend their current corrective action and restructuring plans. The plans will include analysis of previous actions and outcomes and delineate more substantive measures to address subgroups not making AYP.

Schools identified as Focused and Comprehensive will be responsible for the provision of public school choice and supplemental educational services as discussed earlier and as outlined in **Attachment #2 - [Differentiated Accountability Chart](#)**

District officials will be required to ensure that students participating in Choice and SES during the 2007-08 school year will continue to have those options available to them during the transitional 2008-09 school year. In 2009-2010, students whose home school is no longer required to implement public school choice must be allowed to remain in their school of choice, but the district's responsibility to provide transportation ends.

While Indiana's SES participation rate already is above the national average, it is expected that student participation in SES will increase as a result of: (1) offering SES in Year 1 instead of waiting until Year 2; (2) requiring schools to offer multiple enrollment periods; (3) allowing SES providers access on-site for providing after school tutoring; and (4) requiring Comprehensive schools to provide SES transportation.

**Core Principle 6: Transparency of Differentiation and Interventions**

The proposed process for differentiation and the resulting interventions for schools identified as either Focused or Comprehensive are data-driven, understandable, and will be transparent to the public.

Schools are differentiated according to the percentage of cells (overall and subgroups) missing AYP targets as well as the distance from those English/language arts and mathematics achievement targets. Please see **Attachment # 3 - [Index Rating](#)** for the results of this data

analysis. Upon approval as a differentiated accountability model state, IDOE will provide the following information to its districts and to the general public:

- Press Release from the State Superintendent.
- Email notifications to district superintendents, school principals, and local Title I program administrators.
- Webcast available to public.
- Meetings held with **Comprehensive** schools.
- Updated lists on website identifying **Focused** and **Comprehensive** schools.
- Fact Sheet explaining **Focused** and **Comprehensive** school identification and resulting interventions.
- Fall Administrative Meetings for Title I Program Administrators.

Public reporting requirements will not change under the differentiated model. Upon public release of testing results, the state will hold a televised press conference. The press release, video, fact sheets, and lists of identified schools and districts will also be available on the state website as discussed in Core Principles 1 and 2.

### **III: Interventions**

#### **Core Principle 7: Intervention Timeline**

All identified schools receiving Title I funds and identified for improvement are subject to interventions, and they progress through a timeline whereby interventions increase in intensity. The IDOE describes its comprehensive system of interventions, including, as applicable, how its proposal aligns with its state accountability system.

Please reference **Attachment # 2- [Differentiated Accountability Chart](#)** for a chart of interventions implemented under current law as well as the proposed differentiated accountability interventions. Table 3 identifies each proposed intervention by first year of required implementation. A description of each intervention follows Table 3.

**Table 3: Table of Interventions**

Supplemental Educational Services	Year 1 and beyond Focused and Comprehensive
Public School Choice	Year 2 and beyond Focused and Comprehensive
Teacher Leader Training/On-line Training Modules	Year 3 and beyond Focused
Focused Corrective Action	Year 5 and beyond Focused
Focused-Intensive	Year 8 and beyond
Required Diagnostic Tools	Year 1 and beyond Comprehensive

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

	Year 8 and beyond Focused-Intensive
Coaches (Literacy and Math)	Year 1 and beyond Comprehensive
Indiana Reading Academy Math Now	Year 3 and beyond Comprehensive
Indiana Algebra Initiative	Year 3 and beyond Comprehensive
Comprehensive Corrective Action	Year 3 Comprehensive
Restructuring	Year 4 - Planning Year 5 and beyond –Implementation Comprehensive
State Support Teams	Comprehensive-Intensive Focused-Intensive
Institute for School Leadership Teams	Comprehensive-Intensive
School Improvement Grants	Comprehensive

### Teacher Leader Training/On-line Modules

“Professional development in a technological age requires new definitions and new resources. It cannot take the traditional forms of individual workshops or one-time training sessions. Instead, it must be viewed as an ongoing and integral part of teachers' professional lives.” – Joellen Killian, Director of Special Projects for the National Staff Development Council

In order to address the need for responsive and individual support for teachers during implementation of evidenced-based instructional practices and school improvement, IDOE is developing on-line modules. These modules are structured around readings, discussion forums, and on-line conversations with colleagues and experts in the field that will address common questions and challenges that educators face. In addition, participants will have access to a library of on-line resources and will be able to practice back in their own buildings.

Modules will be divided into strands for the instruction of students with disabilities, English language learners, students of poverty, and strategies for effective instruction, curriculum, and assessment. Modules currently under development will be incorporated into the Differentiated Accountability Model in 2009-2010. To bridge the gap, a series of regional trainings will be hosted by IDOE during the 2008-2009 school year to help schools strengthen curriculum and to address specific needs of targeted subgroups not making AYP. Grade level teacher leaders will attend the regional meetings in 2008-2009. The on-line modules will be required for classroom teachers and principals/instructional leaders beginning with the 2009-10 school year.

Funding to support regional workshops and on-line modules will come from a variety of sources including Title I, Title III and IDEA, Part B funds.

### **Focused Corrective Action**

Under the current accountability system, school Corrective Action Plans (Year 3 requirement) are developed and approved at the local level. Under the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model, the Corrective Action Plans for Focused schools must be implemented at Year 5 and will require IDOE review and approval by a multidisciplinary panel at Year 8. Corrective actions are limited to the four options described below for Year 5 and beyond Focused schools.

- Replace staff responsible for continued failure to make AYP; or
- Hire full-time literacy or math coach; or
- Sufficiently extend the school day or year to address the needs of students not making AYP; or
- Schools not making AYP in the Limited English Proficient (LEP) subgroup may hire an English Language Learner (ELL) specialist a minimum of half-time to coach classroom teachers and to ensure appropriate interventions are provided for ELL students.

### **Background and Rationale for ELL Specialist as a Corrective Action**

During U.S. Department of Education LEP Partnership Meetings with states, federal officials reported that the national percentage of change in English language learners (ELLs) from 1994-95 to 2004-05 increased 46.6 percent. With an increase of 407.8 percent over that 10-year period, Indiana's percentage increase ranked second largest in the nation, with Kentucky at 417.8 percent. With the ever-increasing numbers of ELL students, many Indiana districts and schools need additional professional development for classroom teachers on how to best meet the needs of students.

Schools selecting this corrective action option are obligated to employ, at a minimum, a .5 FTE ELL specialist. The individual may be funded through a variety of sources such as Title I, Title II and Title III funds to serve as classroom coaches and to help ensure that appropriate interventions are provided for ELL students. The IDOE [Office of English Language Learning & Migrant Education](#) staff can provide support to school specialists and classroom teachers in using the research-based strategies provided in the [Doing What Works](#) Practice Guide developed by an expert panel convened by the Institute of Education Sciences. Recommended practices include: (1) conducting formative assessments to screen for reading problems and monitor progress; (2) providing intensive, small-group reading interventions for ELLs at risk; (3) providing extensive and varied vocabulary instruction throughout the day; (4) developing academic English competence beginning in the primary grades; and (5) scheduling regular peer-assisted learning opportunities, including structured language practice.

Funding for this initiative will come predominately from Title I, Title III and the state-funded Non-English Speaking grants.

Focused-Intensive Year 8 and beyond

## **State Reading and Mathematics Diagnostic Tools**

### Wireless Generation Diagnostic Assessments

The K-2 Diagnostic Assessments are a new component of the Indiana Assessment System which will take effect in the 2008-2009 school year. The K-2 Diagnostic Assessments include English/language arts and mathematics options to enable teachers to target instruction to each student's needs and to monitor each student's progress toward mastery in those content areas. The English/language arts tool, *mCLASS®: Reading 3D™*, is an integration of Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS®) and Reading Records. DIBELS alerts teachers to problems in student learning and informs teachers of student progress. Reading Records helps teachers learn more about students' error patterns, reading strategies, and comprehension. The mathematics tool, *mCLASS®: Math*, is used to help identify students at-risk of not acquiring proficient early math skills and aids teachers in learning more about students' mathematical thinking. Like *mCLASS®: Reading 3D™*, *mCLASS®: Math* also offers suggestions for teachers in how to approach instruction after uncovering student information.

These tools take advantage of technology by requiring the use of a Palm handheld device to administer the assessments. Teachers are able to monitor individual student progress in the classroom using one-minute "probes" using the Palm devices in order to make decisions about subsequent instruction. The Palm devices must "sync" (upload) data to one computer at the school. This computer must be linked to the Internet.

### Acuity

The Acuity assessment fulfills the Grades 3-8 diagnostic component of the Statewide Assessment System written by the Indiana State Board of Education. Within the Acuity assessment, schools have the availability to utilize information from three distinctive assessments: benchmark assessments, predictive assessments and custom tests built from an extensive item bank. The benchmark assessments are given four times per school year and cover material within a specific quarter. Scope and sequence documents were used to develop the benchmark assessments. Schools have the flexibility to move test items to a different benchmark assessment to better meet their needs, if they determine that a specific skill is not taught until later in the school year. The predictive assessments are given three times a year in English Language Arts and Mathematics and two times per year for Science and Social Studies. This assessment will assist teachers in gauging how a student may perform on ISTEP+. A final assessment within Acuity is the ability for educators to create custom tests that can be given in the classroom on a more frequent basis. These tests are created from an item bank, which allows the teacher to select items that align to a specific indicator.

Professional development in the use of Acuity will focus on an overall introduction to the Acuity assessment, data analysis and interpretation of results. Teachers will have the opportunity to view sample reports within the introductory session. Once data have been collected by a school, through giving assessments, a follow up session will walk teachers through what the data means

and how to interpret the information in order to impact instruction. In this session, teachers will create a 6-8 week action plan that can be implemented at their school.

### **Literacy or Math Coaches**

Coaching is a professional development delivery model that has been shown to improve instruction. Coaches will be trained using the Indiana Reading First Coaches Training Curriculum and deployed for the purpose of serving as intensive Literacy or Math Coaches. In this model, professional development begins with reading-specific training that focuses on theory and instructional practice. Coaching extends this training by providing on-site support and guidance. Coaches work collaboratively with teachers to set professional goals for developing, extending, and improving effective research-based instructional skills, strategies, and practices. Coaches are members of the school leadership team who take an active role in improving classroom instruction and intervention by:

- Sharing their expertise through training and in-class support;
- Demonstrating lessons and helping teachers refine instruction; and
- Observing teachers' practices and providing feedback, support, and ongoing assistance with scientifically based reading research (SBRR) strategies, programs and assessments.

The school coach will partner with the principal and teachers to facilitate a school's development of a sound vision based on developing the capacity of student learning. The school coach will share scientific research-based instructional practices and address teacher concerns. The coach will also work closely with the principal to ensure quality instruction. The school coach will act as a liaison between the school and the district, communicating training and fidelity of proven instructional strategies.

The interaction of the coach and teachers will be guided by the analysis of student learning. The coach will assist the teachers with data interpretation and monitoring student progress. Coaches will encourage teachers to provide systematic and explicit instruction and to differentiate instruction to better meet student needs. This process will include helping to develop Response to Intervention (RtI) programs.

### **Indiana Reading Academy Training**

Indiana Teacher Reading Academies, incorporating Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts, will provide teachers and principals with the important research-based instructional tools on how to enhance any core reading program recently adopted. The new Academies are (a) based on scientific research that has determined how children learn to read, what factors impede reading development, and which instructional approaches are most effective; (b) include grade specific professional development covering the essential components of early reading; (c) incorporate the Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts; (d) include SBRR instructional strategies that are both explicit and systematic and can be used to strengthen any adopted core reading program; (e) provide instruction in the appropriate



## Differentiated Accountability Proposal Indiana Department of Education

monitoring and assessing of critical literacy skills, and (f) include professional development in how to use the data from the state's new diagnostic assessment tools, i.e., Mclass 3D for K-2 and Acuity for 3– 8, to develop a plan for providing students with effective literacy instruction.

Beginning June 2008, staff trained by IDOE and located at regional Education Services Centers across the state will offer optional 2-day Indiana Teacher Reading Academies for school district and charter school staff. To ensure that our highest need schools avail themselves of this important training, the Differentiated Accountability Model requires the participation of all K-3 teachers and principals in Comprehensive schools at Year 3 or higher.

While the majority of the 2-day Academy will be spent in grade-level specific training, a portion of the Academy includes content that is common to all grades (e.g., classroom management & organizing your classroom for differentiated instruction; and understanding and implementing effective RtI 3-Tier intervention strategies).

IDOE's Office of Early Learning and Literacy features detailed information about the new [Indiana Teacher Reading Academies](#) on its web site.

### **Math Now**

Beginning June 2008, IDOE also will pilot a Math Now Academy for Grades K-1 based on lessons learned from the National Math Panel Report's 45 findings and recommendations for instructional practices, materials, professional development and assessments. **We anticipate embedding this initiative into the Differentiated Accountability Model as part of the Indiana Teacher Reading (and Math) Academies beginning in 2009-2010.**

### **Indiana Algebra Initiative**

The I-STEM (Indiana Science Technology Engineering Mathematics) Resource Network is a partnership of Indiana's public and private higher education institutions, K-12 schools, business and government. It supports K-12 teachers and leaders working to implement high academic standards towards STEM literacy for all students. The Indiana Department of Education will partner with the I-STEM Resource Network to offer professional development opportunities for middle school mathematics teachers, Algebra I teachers and administrators on working with students who are at risk of failing Algebra I and Core 40 Algebra I End-of-Course Assessment beginning June 2008. The effort, Indiana Algebra Initiative (IAI), is supported by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title II, Part A. The IAI effort is based on findings and recommendations of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel including the research showing that if students do well in algebra, they are more likely to succeed in college and be ready for better career opportunities in the global economy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings said on the occasion of the release of the panel's final report that "We must increase access to algebra and other rigorous coursework if we hope to close the achievement gap between poor and minority students and their peers."

## Differentiated Accountability Proposal Indiana Department of Education

To better address the needs of students not making AYP in mathematics in Title I Comprehensive Year 3 (and higher) middle schools, teachers and principals will be required to attend the new Indiana Algebra Initiative professional development trainings.

### **Indiana Adolescent Literacy Strategic Initiative**

In a typical high-poverty urban school, roughly half of incoming ninth-grade students read at a sixth or seventh grade level (Balfanz et al., 2002). Indiana is embarking on an Adolescent Literacy Strategic Initiative that will target middle schools as the frontline for making instructional and infrastructure improvements so that students may succeed in high school, college and beyond. Strategies for changing the infrastructure involve professional learning communities, literacy leadership teams, and interdisciplinary school-wide implementation. “Among researchers, school reformers, and professional associations, the consensus view is that every middle and high school teacher has a role to play in helping students become fully literate” (Alliance for Excellent Education, Issue Brief, June 2006). Based on this premise, the Indiana Department of Education will lead the initiative beginning in June 2008 working with a ten school pilot to help systematically incorporate adolescent literacy efforts into every school day. A website that includes tools, resources and strategies will be launched in summer 2008 for use by all schools. **To support the needs of middle schools identified as not having made AYP, the Indiana Adolescent Literacy Strategic Initiative will be considered for inclusion in the Differentiated Accountability Model beginning in 2009-2010.**

### **Comprehensive Corrective Action**

Under the current accountability system, school Corrective Action Plans (Year 3 requirement) are developed and approved at the local level. Under the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model, the Corrective Action Plans will require IDOE review and approval by a multidisciplinary panel. Corrective actions are limited to the four options described below for Year 3 Comprehensive schools.

- Replace staff responsible for continued failure to make AYP; or
- Replace principal or appoint outside mentor a minimum of half-time within the school; or
- Sufficiently extend the school day or year to address the needs of students not making AYP; or
- Schools not making AYP in the LEP subgroup may hire an ELL specialist a minimum of half-time to coach classroom teachers and to ensure appropriate interventions are provided for ELL students.

### **Restructuring**

Districts with schools identified as Year 4 in 2007-2008 were required to plan for restructuring and districts with schools in Year 5 and beyond must continue to implement and refine their restructuring plans. Plans are due to IDOE by June 2008 using the template approved October 2007 by the Committee of Practitioners. Due to the timing of this proposal, as well as deadlines

## Differentiated Accountability Proposal Indiana Department of Education

for local contractual obligations, Indiana will honor these plans for the 2008-2009 school year and review them under the current accountability regulations.

Beginning with schools implementing Restructuring in 2009-2010, options under the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model will be limited as follows:

- Replace principal leader if leader has remained the same during sustained failure to make AYP and replace all staff responsible for the failure to make AYP;
- Close the school;
- Close the school and reopen the school as a charter school;
- Contract with a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness to assume responsibility for the school's operation.

### **Restructuring Year 8 and Beyond Comprehensive**

Since Indiana fully implemented the accountability system required under the previous federal law (*Improving America's Schools Act*), schools identified for improvement under that legislation were not permitted to "start over" in their improvement status under the new *No Child Left Behind Act*. Indiana, therefore, has schools in higher levels of improvement than most other states across the nation. We believe it is important to examine the effectiveness of existing restructuring initiatives and, as needed, take proactive steps to ensure that appropriate steps are taken to dramatically increase student achievement for schools already well into the implementation of their previously-approved restructuring plans.

Consequently, under the proposed Differentiating Accountability Model, and beginning in fall 2008, superintendents with Comprehensive schools identified as Year 8 will be required to resubmit and publicly defend their restructuring plan before an IDOE panel. The plan will include an analysis of previous restructuring actions and outcomes and delineate more substantive actions for improving student achievement. The panel will either approve the plan or specify the actions needed for approval.

### **State Support Teams**

Through a formal request for proposal, Indiana has identified and selected two providers of school support team services for high priority schools. RMC Research, B & D Consulting and distinguished educators in Indiana will be utilized to provide the following services for Comprehensive-Intensive schools and Focused-Intensive school over a two-year period:

- Review and analyze all facets of the school's operation, including the design and operation of the instructional program, and assist in developing recommendations for improving student performance;
- Collaborate with parents and staff around the design, implementation, and monitoring of a plan for improving student performance and meeting goals for improvement, including adequate yearly progress;

## Differentiated Accountability Proposal Indiana Department of Education

- Evaluate the effectiveness of school personnel, including identifying outstanding teachers and principals, and make findings and recommendations to the school, the district, and the IDOE;
- Make recommendations concerning additional assistance that is needed in the district; and
- Submit monthly formal reports to IDOE.

Focused-Intensive schools will receive focused support directly related to areas of most concern.

Funding for this initiative will come from federal School Improvement funds with support from the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center.

### **Institute for School Leadership Teams**

An analysis of Indiana schools in the highest levels of need (Comprehensive-Intensive) calls for additional IDOE support for high-poverty, low-performing urban schools. Through IDOE's partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center and discussions with Dr. Sam Redding, director of the Center on Innovation and Improvement, we have used research<sup>5</sup> to inform the development of a new Institute for School Leadership Teams which began April 2008. The Institute is led by Cheryl Williams, Director of Outreach at [West Ed's Learning Innovations](#).

The Institute is a two-year program for school leaders that are ready to

- Implement a team approach to instructional leadership;
- Use data to determine students' needs and plan appropriate teacher and student response;
- Utilize research-based practices from high-performing, high-poverty urban districts;
- Receive support from current and recent successful urban principals; and
- Meet, work, and plan on a regular basis with a team of teachers, the principal, and a representative from the district.

The Institute begins with on-site visits from the facilitator, who is a current or recent urban principal from a high performing, high poverty school. The facilitator works with the School Leadership Team (SLT) using data to identify the areas of focus for the year that will impact

---

<sup>5</sup> 2006-How to Manage Urban School Districts. Childress, S., Elmore, R., & Grossman, A. Harvard Business School and Graduate school of Education: Public Education Leadership Project (PELP); 2007- The kids left behind: Catching up to the underachieving children of poverty. Barr, R.D. & Parrett, W.H. (p.38-39); 1999- Hope for Urban Education: A study of nine high-performing, high-poverty urban, elementary schools. The Charles A. Dana Center, The University of Texas at Austin

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

student achievement. IDOE will plan a 2008 summer academy based on the unique needs of each participating school. The summer academy will provide whole group presentations, small group presentations and many opportunities for team work. Following the summer academy, the facilitators will communicate with the SLT regularly through on-site visits and phone conferences. Additional one-day School-Year Sessions will convene the school teams for group work that will occur in October, January and April. The second year of the Institute will be scheduled based on needs identified by the facilitators and SLTs over the course of year-one work.

Funding for this initiative will come from federal School Improvement funds with support from the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center.

## **School Improvement Grants**

Currently, section 1003(a) improvement funds are distributed to all Title I schools in improvement status. Schools in higher levels of improvement receive larger grants than schools in lower levels of improvement, as shown by [2007-2008 School Improvement Grants](#). In order to dramatically improve the achievement of students in our highest need schools, and to support the new requirements of the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model, beginning with the 2008-09 school year, these funds will be directed to schools identified as Comprehensive.

The new section 1003(g) improvement funds have currently been awarded –through a highly-competitive grant award process -- to seven schools in varying levels of improvement status. With the additional funds available to Indiana in 2008-2009, a second competitive application process will be offered. Competitive priority is given to those schools with highest need based on percentages of students passing state testing as well as the percentage of students in poverty as defined by free/reduced lunch status. Allowable uses of grant funds include:

- Customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of district and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures. Assistance may include data analysis as related to problems with classroom instruction, professional development, and parental involvement; identification and implementation of high-quality strategies supported in the school improvement plan; and analysis of budgets and resources to augment reform efforts; and
- Research based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified.

### **Core Principle 8: Types of Interventions: Aligned Resources**

The IDOE recognizes that interventions must be educationally sound and we have provided rationale, including evidence of effectiveness, for each intervention proposed in the previous pages under Core Principle 7. IDOE will leverage state grants, local resources and federal Title I, School Improvement, Title II, Title III, Reading First and IDEA, Part B funds to promote meaningful reform in schools, provide options for parents and students, and improve teacher and school leadership performance.

To enhance the statewide system of support, IDOE offices are collaborating and will meet regularly to discuss the assistance that is provided to Focused schools through the IDOE-sponsored teacher trainings at regional workshops and through new on-line course modules. Our Comprehensive schools will benefit from collaborative IDOE efforts to train teachers and coaches. Focused and Comprehensive Year 8 schools will defend their corrective action and restructuring plans before an IDOE panel of experts representing the various students populations at risk in those schools. Plans that have not proven to be effective will be revised for approval by the panel

## Differentiated Accountability Proposal Indiana Department of Education

IDOE will build an automated tool(s) to support the focused and continuous monitoring of our schools –especially those identified as Comprehensive -- and will utilize data existing in state databases to create a dashboard of results. The Oracle Business Intelligence product will be employed for this integrated diagnostic reporting. [Oracle Business Intelligence Suite Enterprise Edition Plus \(Oracle BI EE Plus\)](#) is a comprehensive suite of enterprise BI products that delivers a full range of analysis and reporting capabilities. This tool provides the ability to review results in summary as well access details through drill down capabilities. Dashboarding is a key component of the Oracle BI tool. This tool will enable us to be targeted and specific with year-round monitoring for each of our Comprehensive schools.

The new Institute for School Leadership Teams for high-need, low-performing urban schools is building the capacity of instructional leaders throughout the state. Future plans consist of the possible inclusion of these leaders as providers of State Support Team services. Through the state's district Corrective Action initiatives, internal coaches are being trained as providers of professional development and training to districts, and in turn, schools. For more information on IDOE's efforts to enhance curriculum development and implementation, please see [Resources for Districts in Improvement and Corrective Action](#).

IDOE capacity continues to be strengthened through its close association and continuous partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center and its subcontractor providers. Initiatives such as the Institute for School Leadership Teams, the State Support Teams, the Teacher Leadership Training, and the LEA Corrective Action for curriculum mapping are examples of the collaborative work with Great Lakes East for building state capacity.

### **Core Principle 9: Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services (SES)**

IDOE's proposed Differentiated Accountability Model is designed to result in an increased number of students participating, in the aggregate, in public school choice and supplemental educational services at the state level.

As outlined in **Attachment # 2 -[Differentiated Accountability Chart](#)**, under the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model, public school Choice will not be implemented until Year 2 for both Focused and Comprehensive schools. Instead, Year 1 schools will be required to offer Supplemental Educational Services (SES). Beginning in Year 2, Choice will be offered to all non-proficient students in Focused and Comprehensive schools. Supplemental Educational Services will be offered to all non-proficient students in poverty in both Focused and Comprehensive schools.

Unlike the current accountability system, under the proposed Differentiated model, Comprehensive schools will be required to provide transportation for any SES opportunity. In addition, in both Focused and Comprehensive schools, providers must be allowed (upon request from the provider) to deliver services in the school building outside of the school day. Further, enrollment opportunities must be opened at multiple points throughout the year. With the implementation of these proposed changes, the IDOE anticipates the identification of additional



Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

students and further opportunities for services will improve student participation in the aggregate. Statewide Choice and SES participation over time is provided in **Attachment # 4**.

The IDOE has taken several actions to improve the quality and availability of SES. On an annual basis every provider is given an on-site monitoring visit, which includes a detailed report of tutoring observed by state personnel. Every two years, providers are asked to submit documents related to tutor qualifications, academic programming, progress reporting, and individual program design. This information is reviewed, and feedback on improvement necessary is given to providers. Where needed, providers are required to submit corrective action plans. In subsequent years, progress toward successful implementation of corrective action is monitored. Providers that are not appropriately implementing corrective action are subject to removal from the state-approved list.

As part of the state's ongoing efforts for increasing the availability of SES, IDOE staff have presented at several workshops for the federal Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in an attempt to increase the number of local and community-based providers. Additionally, information on how to become a provider has been shared with Indiana-based organizations such as the Indiana Youth Institute. Indiana also has a parent task force, which is comprised of parents from a variety of cities in Indiana who are currently participating in SES. This task force discusses how SES can be improved, as well as how more parents can become involved in SES. Each year, the IDOE works to ensure that each SES district has no fewer than four provider options from which parents may choose. In any district where this is not the case (in 2007-2008, all districts had at least four options), the IDOE contacts providers to see if they might be able or willing to serve underserved districts.

SES participation is monitored in several ways. A mid-year data collection occurs in the fall to determine first semester participation. Schools with participation below the prior year's state average are contacted to assess implementation issues and barriers. End of the year data are collected and analyzed in comparison to the mid-year collection. Fiscal expenditures for choice and SES are collected and analyzed in comparison to participation data. Title I on-site monitoring verifies timely and parent-friendly notifications, mailing receipts, participation, and fiscal expenditures.

The IDOE shares information about the evaluation process at the annual district workshop and at the annual provider workshop. The evaluation is detailed in the state's [IDOE SES Policies and Procedures](#). The evaluation is reviewed each year, and potential enhancements are discussed with the SES Provider Task Force. In addition, the Policies and Procedures (which include the evaluation process) are developed in collaboration with the state's Title I Committee of Practitioners. Every two years, the state has the evaluation process reviewed by an independent party. Currently, the evaluation process is being reviewed by American Institute for Research (AIR) under a contract with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center, operated by Learning Point Associates. Information about the state's evaluation process as well as SES resources available to districts, parents, and providers is easily accessible on the IDOE's comprehensive [SES Website](#).

In order to ensure that school districts are providing timely and appropriate notice of public school choice and supplemental educational services to parents of eligible students, the IDOE will continue to approve parent notification letters prior to district mailing. The IDOE has developed sample letters in English and Spanish as well as checklists for schools and districts to assist in meeting all requirements and deadlines. Districts new to implementing SES must attend the state's training to discuss requirements as well as available resources. This training is also available on-line after the meeting for districts to review.

The state's parent task force has provided a variety of suggestions for increasing parent awareness of SES. As previously mentioned, the IDOE instituted a plan as of 2006-2007 to ensure that districts with enrollments less than that of the state average must re-open SES enrollments and provide documentation that a variety of methods have been used to ensure that parents have been appropriately made aware of SES. The IDOE is also working with the state's PIRC (Parent Information and Resource Center) to best determine ways in which IDOE and the PIRC can collaborate on increasing awareness about SES.

## **Section IV. Restructuring**

### **Core Principle 10: Significant and Comprehensive Interventions for Consistently Lowest-Performing Schools**

Indiana's proposed Differentiated Accountability Model identifies a subset of the lowest-performing schools that have not made AYP for five years or more (currently the restructuring category). This is clearly evidenced in **Attachment #2 - [Differentiated Accountability Chart](#)** as well as within the narrative provided throughout this proposal. Comprehensive schools are subject to the most significant and comprehensive interventions.

Since the inception of NCLB, the majority of Indiana schools undergoing Restructuring have elected to implement "other alternative governance," as approved by the IDOE. Under the proposed Differentiating Accountability Model and beginning with Comprehensive schools implementing Restructuring in 2009-2010, the IDOE will no longer allow a restructuring plan to include the "other alternative governance" option. The remaining options are those considered to be substantive and comprehensive in section 1116(b)(8)(B). State law currently prohibits the state takeover of schools. Collective bargaining agreements reached under state law may limit restructuring actions that may be taken unilaterally by school boards. School boards must bargain collectively with teachers. Mandatory bargaining subjects include salary, wages, hours, and related fringe benefits. School boards must discuss and may bargain the following:

- Working conditions, beyond the mandatory subjects.
- Curriculum development and revision.
- Textbook selection.
- Teaching methods.
- Hiring, promotion, demotion, transfer, assignment, and retention of licensed employees.
- Student discipline.
- Expulsion or supervision of students.
- Pupil/teacher ratio.
- Class size or budget appropriations.

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

The State Board of Education has discussed ways to provide options for flexibility from restrictive bargaining agreement provisions. Legislation is required.

While all Comprehensive schools are subject to the most significant interventions under the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model, 20 percent of those schools with the highest (worst) Index rating will be further identified as **Comprehensive-Intensive**. Beyond the interventions provided all Comprehensive schools, Comprehensive-Intensive schools will receive additional intensive support through state support teams, required participation in The Institute for School Leadership Teams, and school improvement grants. These interventions are described in **Core Principle 7**.

As noted earlier in this proposal, schools may only exit the identified category by either meeting the requirements of another category for two consecutive years or by making AYP for two consecutive years. Identification timelines and method for calculating AYP are not changed by the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model.

Schools that undertake *significant* restructuring interventions may be determined to be a “new” school. As approved by the U.S. Department of Education, for accountability purposes, an Indiana school is identified as a “new” school if it meets the following threshold criteria:

- (1) a change of at least 50 percent of the student population from the previous year; or
- (2) a change in grade configuration that involves at least 50 percent of the former grade levels, either by elimination or addition, and accompanied by significant change in educational philosophy or staffing.

Prior to designating a school as “new,” the AYP history of the school is considered and there must be no evidence that the change was made to avoid accountability. The preponderance of the evidence must reasonably lead to the conclusion that comparisons cannot fairly be made to the previous year's performance. Further, if at least 50 percent of the students in a “new” school would have received Supplemental Educational Services in the previous school, the IDOE requires the district to continue SES eligibility in the new school until it demonstrates AYP for two consecutive years.

## Section V: Differentiation Data Analysis

The IDOE has provided data analyses to support the proposed model of differentiation using the most current data available from the fall 2007 testing administration. Table 4 identifies each analysis included in the proposal. Additionally, the state assures that all student performance and accountability files have been submitted to *EDFacts* and that such data are accurate.

**Table 4: Breakdown of Data Analyses**

Data Analysis	Location in Proposal
State’s Proposed Method of Differentiation	<a href="#">Index Rating</a>
Analysis of Title I Schools in Improvement by	<a href="#">Analysis of Schools by SI Year, Grade Span,</a>

Grade Span and Enrollment	<a href="#">and Enrollment</a>
AYP Disaggregation	<a href="#">AYP Results: By the Numbers</a>
Choice and SES Eligibility Over Time	<a href="#">Choice and SES Eligibility Over Time</a>

## Section VI: Annual Evaluation Plan

With the proposed concentrated focus of school improvement resources to schools identified as Comprehensive, it is imperative that the return on this investment is measured. To support the continuation of effective interventions and to identify ineffective strategies, a rigorous examination and evaluation of the implementation and outcomes of the model is needed. The IDOE will immediately solicit a Request for Proposal (RFP) and identify a qualified organization that will conduct a formal evaluation of school improvement initiatives and resulting student achievement under the proposed Differentiated Accountability Model. At a minimum, proposals must address the Research Questions identified in Table 5. The evaluation will include survey assessments, the IDOE's *Uniform Evaluation Tool* to measure the effectiveness of professional development efforts, and extensive data analyses from state testing results incorporating the use of data dashboarding as discussed in Core Principle 8.

**Table 5: Proposed Research Questions for Evaluation**

Research Questions
1. To what extent are schools focused on improving English/language arts and mathematics?
2. To what extent are schools focused on and making progress toward improving instruction in English/language arts and Mathematics?
3. What conditions and practices facilitate effective implementation of school improvement initiatives?
4. What conditions and practices are barriers to implementation of school improvement initiatives?
5. To what degree did IDOE-sponsored trainings help teachers and school leaders improve student achievement?
6. How has student achievement outcomes changed over time?
7. How do student achievement scores from identified schools compare with achievement scores from non-identified schools having similar demographics and conditions over time?
8. How do student achievement scores compare with statewide achievement scores over time?
9. What relationships exist between school improvement initiatives and student achievement?
10. What is the impact on school improvement identification under the Differentiated Accountability Model versus the original NCLB model?
11. What are the implications of the study for state policy makers?

Differentiated Accountability Proposal  
Indiana Department of Education

Indiana will include in its evaluation plan an analysis of the degree to which the proposed method of differentiation identified schools needing the greatest interventions. We will use research to determine if the computations correctly identify the schools that are known by other means to be the most seriously in distress and exclude schools that are recognized not to need the most intense levels of services. We will also determine potential adjustments to the differentiated method that are found to produce greater accuracy.

IDOE will embrace the idea of collaborating with USDE in employing an evaluation design for use across all states participating in the differentiated model pilot.